

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicants appreciate the courtesy extended to Patrick G. Burns and Matthew Hitching, in a telephonic interview on November 29, 2004. The rejections of claim 1 and claim 27 were discussed, without reaching agreement. The Interview Summary mailed December 10, 2004 adequately describes the discussion of claim 1. Claim 1 has been cancelled, without prejudice, and will be pursued in a continuation application. Applicants' arguments regarding claim 27 are described below.

As another preliminary matter, applicants appreciate the examiner's comments and consideration with regard to claim 27. The claim as presented in this amendment is correct.

Claim 43 stands objected to based on informalities which have been corrected by amendment, without narrowing the scope of the claim. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The remaining independent claims are claims 27, 36, 38 and 43. Each independent claim stands rejected, based in part on "Official Notice". See ¶ 45 of the office action regarding claim 27, ¶ 58 regarding claim 38, ¶ 66 regarding claim 43, and ¶ 89 regarding claim 36. Applicants respectfully traverse these findings, and request that they be supported with evidence if the rejections are not withdrawn, for the following reasons.

Referring to independent claim 27, the examiner acknowledges in ¶ 44 that Faraboschi does not disclose outputting a compressed program storable in a program

memory, comprising compressed form instructions together with imaginary address information specifying an assigned imaginary address of at least one original instruction, so that, when the compressed form instructions are decompressed and loaded by the processor into an instruction cache, the processor can allocate the assigned imaginary address to the decompressed instructions based on the imaginary address information.

In ¶ 45, the examiner takes “Official Notice” that it is well known that a computer counter stores address information that points to the address of an instruction to be accessed in the instruction memory, and their address information could be easily stored with the instruction to allow for faster look-ups in the memory just like a cache tag, but provides no evidence to support Official Notice of these multiple facts. The examiner then concludes that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to perform the claim elements not found in Faraboschi.

The examiner’s premises and his conclusions are unsupported. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection, or evidence to support the examiner’s premises and conclusions.

The examiner recognizes that Faraboschi does not disclose an element of claim 38 in ¶ 57 of the office action, and asserts Official Notice, again without evidence. The examiner makes several leaps of logic to draw an unfounded conclusion of obviousness with respect to this claim. Since both the premises and conclusions are unfounded, applicants request withdrawal of this rejection, as well, or evidence to support the premises and conclusions of the examiner.

Similar assertions are made with respect to claim 43, in ¶¶ 65 and 66 of the office action, and with respect to independent claim 36, in ¶¶ 88 and 89 of the office action. For the reasons previously given, applicants request withdrawal of these rejections, or evidence to support the premises and conclusions.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

April 13, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\0808\65559\780047.DOC